

CONGRESS OF FUTURE MEDICAL LEADERS

HON. KEN BUCK

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 21, 2018

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Lance Tanner, who was chosen by the National Academy of Future Physicians and Medical Scientists to represent the State of Colorado as Delegates at the Congress of Future Medical Leaders.

The Congress is an honors-only program for top students in our country who aspire to be physicians or medical scientists. These students are nominated by their teachers or the Academy based on their leadership ability, academic achievement, and dedication. This program is designed to inspire young people to go into medical research fields or be physicians, and provides a path, plan, and mentoring resources to help them reach their goal. During the Congress, the students will have the chance to learn from leaders in the medical field as well as government officials, top medical school deans, leaders from the private sector, and even Nobel laureates.

This student's acceptance to this prestigious program is an incredible feat, and it is my honor to rise today and recognize the outstanding accomplishment of this future leader. Our nation greatly benefits from the achievements of physicians and medical scientists, and it is important that we continue to inspire younger generations to pursue careers in the medical field.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the 4th Congressional District of Colorado, I extend my congratulations and best wishes to Lance Tanner.

H.R. 4079, THE RESTORE ACT OF 2017

HON. COLLIN C. PETERSON

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 21, 2018

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my disappointment that the House failed to consider H.R. 4079, the RESTORE Act of 2017, both this and last week. Further, Republican Leadership refused to allow debate or a vote on my bipartisan amendment to attach the legislation to H.R. 6, the SUPPORT for Patients and Communities Act.

Two years ago, the Ensuring Patient Access and Effective Drug Enforcement Act of 2015 passed unanimously in both the House and the Senate and was signed into law. Members were led to believe that the measure was non-controversial and would help patients secure pain medications.

Instead, a joint investigation by "60 Minutes" and the Washington Post appears to confirm that the legislation has limited the DEA's ability to suspend a pharmaceutical distributor's license and shipments if they pose an imminent danger to public health and safety.

The RESTORE Act of 2017 would fully repeal the Ensuring Patient Access and Effective Drug Enforcement Act of 2015 and restore the DEA's authority to carry out needed enforcement actions to combat the opioid epidemic.

Although many of the bills recently passed by the House were bipartisan and took incremental steps toward addressing substance abuse, they did not equip the DEA with the authority that it needs to keep our communities safe and healthy.

I urge Republican Leadership to reconsider this issue and allow the Restore Act of 2017 to be brought to the floor as soon as possible.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY AND COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNMENT REFORM JOINT HEARING ON OVERSIGHT OF THE FBI AND DOJ ACTIONS IN ADVANCE OF THE 2016 ELECTION

HON. SHEILA JACKSON LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 21, 2018

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to discuss the implications of the Committee on the Judiciary and the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform Joint Hearing on the FBI and DOJ Actions in Advance of the 2016 Election.

The Report of the Department of Justice's Inspector General regarding these actions does not vindicate the President or conclude that the Trump Campaign did not collude with Russians to influence the outcome of the 2016 election.

Nothing in this report changes the fact on March 31, 2016, Mr. Trump met with George Papadopoulos at Trump Tower.

This is significant because as we speak, Paul Manafort, the chairman of the Trump Campaign, sits in jail as an indicted money launderer, and an unregistered agent of a foreign government.

Donald Trump is the first sitting president in history whose campaign chairman spent his time behind bars during his own presidential administration.

But Manafort is not the only member of the Trump Campaign staff indicted or to have pleaded guilty to felonies arising out of the Russia investigation.

He is joined by Michael Flynn, former National Security Advisor; Rick Gates, Deputy Campaign Chairman; and George Papadopoulos.

Now that we have discussed what is not present in this report, we can turn to what is included.

This report is clearly the product of attention to detail as well as a commitment to sharing with the American people information about the FBI's investigation into Secretary Hillary Clinton's emails in the days, weeks and months leading to the 2016 election.

I have spent the last few days studying this report which is comprehensive and answers a lot of questions that the American people have about the election.

I would like to acknowledge that I take a back seat to no one when it comes to standing up for law enforcement—they do a difficult job under difficult circumstances.

But I cannot help but notice some glaring things about this report.

The report concludes that while political bias was apparent in the atmosphere leading up to the 2016 election, political bias was not influential in individual decisions which were made.

There exist some operative dates and facts relevant to this inquiry that might cause some Americans to question that conclusion.

First, the announcement by the Inspector General's office that it would be conducting its investigation occurred on January 12, 2017, one week after then-President-elect Trump was briefed by the Intelligence Community about the existence of the FBI's counterintelligence investigation into Russian attempts to meddle into the 2016 election.

Many Americans will find this timing very troubling.

Second, in Chapter 7 of the report, the Inspector General cites all the reasons for concluding that Secretary Clinton did not break the law or have any basis to conclude that she broke the law for her use of a private server.

So it was the Inspector General office's finding that while it did not make any pronouncement on whether the decision was correct, it did say that the decision not to take any action was reasonable, and grounded in the law, facts and applicable DOJ precedent.

Moreover, the decision to on one hand decline prosecution, but on the other to editorialize Secretary Clinton's behavior as extremely careless, appears to be a political decision and one that had the foreseeable effect of harming Hillary Clinton and helping Donald Trump.

The month-long delay between the discovery of additional emails, in late September 2016, and the public announcement of this fact, on October 28, 2016, had the foreseeable effect of harming Secretary Clinton and helping Trump.

Secretary Clinton's campaign was not the subject of a federal counterintelligence investigation by our nation's law enforcement.

But the same is not true with respect to the Trump Campaign, which was under investigation for colluding with a hostile foreign power to influence the outcome of the 2016 election.

So, millions of Americans are left with painful realization that there was actually a pretty persistent double standard in favor of Trump and prejudicial to Clinton.

Under these circumstances, it is reasonable for Americans to conclude that Secretary Clinton was the victim of a double standard.

When the IG's Report was released, the president indicated that this report was a total vindication of him and his campaign in the election.

In fact, nothing in this report exonerates the Trump Campaign of colluding with the Russians.

This is because the IG office did not investigate any aspect of the Russian government's interference in the 2016 election.

One of the concerns the Report had with leaks is both the total universe of people privy to information, and the fact that guidelines about talking to the press were often flouted.

In that section, the Report references the improper disclosure of non-public information specifically as it relates to October 2016—and we seem to have a concern that the weeks that passed between the initial discovery of emails on the Weiner laptop led to their public disclosure in part because DOJ management was concerned that the information would leak anyhow.

In fact, we have documented reports of Rudy Giuliani going on Fox News and claiming to have information about this very subject.

Both in the Executive Summary and in the body of your report, leaks from April 2016 and October 2016 are cited.